

Date: Thu, 21 Apr 94 04:30:08 PDT
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu
Precedence: Bulk
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V94 #179
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest Thu, 21 Apr 94 Volume 94 : Issue 179

Today's Topics:

 "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading
 /AA? (I'm confused)
 VE's license revoked???

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 20 Apr 94 22:14:00 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!elroy.uh.edu!
st3qi@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: "NOCODE" Tech to "TechPLUS" upgrading
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1994Apr20.193002.3527@mixcom.mixcom.com>, kevin jessup
<kevin.jessup@mixcom.mixcom.com> writes...
>When a "codeless" tech "upgrades" to TECH plus 5WPM code, he simply
>gets a CSCE for the 5WPM. No forms get sent to the FCC. At least
>not when I upgraded. I was told to just save the form in case
>someone asked to see it.
>
>Also, when I received my license (March of 1993) there was no
>indication other than TECHNICIAN with PRIMARY privileges. (Will
>this change for future technicians?)
>
>So...what is to prevent a codeless tech from operating 10 meter
>SSB? Who would know that he did NOT upgrade?? Does anybody
>really care? ;-))

```
>
>--
> /'-_      kevin.jessup@mixcom.com
> {      }/      Marquette Electronics, Inc
> \      /      N9SQB, ARRL, Amateur Radio
> |__*|      N9SQB @ WD9ANY.#MKE.WI.USA.NA
```

When the FCC gets their new computer system online they WILL begin to issue Technician and Technician Plus licenses.

The only way to find out if a Technician is "codeless" or "plus" is to call the VEC (W5YI, ARRL, etc) and ask them. Periodically, the VEC's forward this information to the FCC, so the FCC has the information also.

If anyone knows of other avenues, please let me know.

ps. Kevnin, do people call you "Nathan" or "Colonial"? :)

73...

-Brad Killebrew N5LJV
-st3qi@jetson.uh.edu
-President, Univ of Houston ARC

Date: 20 Apr 94 14:02:16 GMT
From: agate!darkstar.UCSC.EDU!news.hal.COM!olivea!news.bu.edu!noc.near.net!
news.tufts.edu!news.hnrc.tufts.edu!jerry@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
Subject: /AA? (I'm confused)
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

I confuse easily. Would someone straighen me out about this?

Suppose a technician upgrades to advanced. Part 97.9(b) says that advanced privileges can be used as long as the individual has a CSCE. 97.119(e) says that a modifier must be used after the call sign. In this case it would be /AA.

My confusion arises because the FCC does not require a change of call signs. Does this mean that if NONNN were to go from Technician to Advanced without requesting a change in call sign, (s)he would be required to use NONNN/AA while the upgrade was being processed but could go back to plain old NONNN once the new license was received!!!???

Thanks.

Date: Tue, 19 Apr 1994 23:07:34 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!world!drt@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: VE's license revoked???
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

Jesse L Wei (jlw3@cec3.wustl.edu) wrote:

: In response to the fact that I am on week 16 waiting for my tech + license,
: I have been increasingly aggressive in finding out what is the holdup with
: my ticket. It turns out that after a considerable amount of prying, I have
: found, to my dismay, that one of the VE's administering my test has had his
: license revoked,

Oh, boy.

: and as a result, they have kept my application an extra ten weeks.
: I am told (by the VEC) to wait another month (21 weeks!!!!!!!)
: for my ticket.

If the "they" in the previous sentence also refers to the VEC, does that
mean that the FCC hasn't even seen your 610 yet? Oh, dear ...

: I am sick and tired of waiting. I will not have any
: equipment at home in dallas to play with, whereas I can use the shack here
: at school IF I GET MY LICENSE BEFORE I LEAVE. A couple of questions:
: (or rather a few)

: 1) what can a ve do to get his license revoked?

Lotsa things. Like take bribes from people who don't care to study
for the exams, for one.

: 2) what can I do to get my license without waiting another month??? Does
: anybody have the addresses of the Texas senators, or representatives
: for precinct 1107 in Texas?

: 3) can the ARRL do anything to find out what is *really* going on with my
: application??? This is *mighty* frustrating!!!

You do have a problem. Politicians won't be able to override the fact
that your test session may be invalid (if you don't have a licence,
you're not a VE, so only 2 VE's have examined you, and of course,
that's not enough). ARRL certainly won't. (They wouldn't happen to
be the VEC in question, would they?) You don't think they're being
straight with you, that it's just an excuse?

: --jesse, and I'm getting really pissed off.

I don't blame you. Not a bit.

But you might want to count your blessings - the FCC could have (and may still) tell you to retake the exams. (This might be faster, actually, if the VEC is just going to sit on your application until Kingdom Come. I guess you'd have to have them return the first 610 - lotsa luck with that one.) The FCC could even tell you you have to retake it from them, if they're suspicious. Hope they let it slide.

And if counting blessings doesn't work? I, for one, would never encourage you to go blow that VE's fool head off. But it might be theraputic to fanatize about it. As a VE myself, people like that make me, in the words of Marvin the Martian, "very angry". Other than that, you may be stuck.

Let us know what happens.

-drt

"That Earth creature has stolen the Immodium Q-38 explosive space modulatorrrr!"

David R. Tucker KG2S 8P9CL drt@world.std.com

Date: 20 Apr 94 17:15:28 GMT
From: dog.ee.lbl.gov!overload.lbl.gov!agate!kabuki.EECS.Berkeley.EDU!
kennish@ucbvax.berkeley.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <CoICtL.6ur@cbnewsd.cb.att.com>, <2p1e19\$m12@clarknet.clark.net>,
<2p3egi\$cbp@dancer.cc.bellcore.com>
Subject : Re: Illinois anti scanner legislation

FLASH - IMPORTANT - ACT NOW...

HOUSE BILL 4180 - 88TH GENERAL ASSEMBLY
STATE OF ILLINOIS 1993 AND 1994

INTRODUCED BY REPRESENTATIVE CROSS ON 12 APRIL 1994

SYNOPSIS AS INTRODUCED 720 ILCS 5/31-9 NEW

LRB8814416RCMB Sec.31-9

Amends the Criminal code of 1961. Prohibits the possession of a receiver or transceiver capable of monitoring or broadcasting police, fire, or other municipal radio frequencies unless the
^^^^^^

device operates exclusively on alternating current power. Penalty is a Class B misdemeanor.

(stuff deleted)

I guess this would also make radar detectors illegal too...

-Ken

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #179
